

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21-27, 30-38, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48-49, and 51-55 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 12, 16, 23, 25, 31, 42, 46, 53, and 55 being independent. Claims 9, 11, 17, 20, 28, 29, 39, 41, 43, 44, 47, and 50 are canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12-14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25-27, 30, 31, 40, 42, 46, 53, and 54 are amended herein. Support for the claim amendments and additions can be found in the original disclosure. Thus, no new matter has been added.

DRAWING OBJECTIONS

The drawings stand objected to because the Office states that “in fig. 15, element 1504 should read ‘Are any *files arranged* in a cluster’” (Office Action, page 2). The drawings are amended as indicated above to address this informality noted in the Office Action and other informalities. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the drawing objections.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The specification stands objected to because the abstract read “...executing associated *the* methods...” The specification is amended as indicated above to address this and other informalities. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the specification objections.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 54 stand objected to because it recites dependency from claim 57. Appropriate dependency is from claim 53. Claim 54 is amended herein to address this informality noted in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the claim objections.

§ 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-8, 16, 18-19, 21, 25-28, 31-38, 46, 48-49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,834,110 (Marconcini). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 1**. Amended Claim 1 now recites a method of signing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising:

identifying at least a first portion of the files in at least one cluster;
determining a cluster signature for each cluster; and
developing an expression that includes the location of the signature,
wherein a second portion of the files comprises a web page
and determining a signature for each web page by determining at least one of:
developing a link to the signature and storing the link in the web page, or
storing the signature in the web page.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed by Marconcini.

The amendments to claim 1 incorporate the recitation of claim 9 which depended on claim 1 and claim 11 which depended on claim 9. Thus, amended claim 1 now presents original dependent claim 11 in independent form. The Office rejected dependent claim 11 under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marconcini in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112162 (Cocotis). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office acknowledges, and Applicant agrees, that Marconcini fails to teach or suggest “determining a signature for a webpage” (Office Action, page 8). Marconcini is directed to “rights management of digital assets, such as print media, films, games, and music over global communications networks” (Column 1, lines 14-16) and discusses “encrypting the data using a first encrypting key; encrypting a first decrypting key using a second encrypting key; dividing at least part of the encrypted data into a series of logical packages; placing at least some of the logical packages into a broadcast carousel” (Column 5, line 65-Column 6, line 2).

Cocotis fails to remedy the deficiencies of Marconcini. Cocotis is directed to “delivering and displaying multimedia content through the Internet” (paragraph 0001) and discusses a system in which “[e]ach content file stored on the server is cryptographically registered and such registration information is stored on the server along with the corresponding file name” (Abstract).

The Office states that “developing a link to the signature and storing the link in the web page,” from Applicant’s claim 1 is taught or suggested by Cocotis paragraph 0043. Cocotis describes a system in which “the *consumer application contains an embedded public key* which corresponds with a private key to be used by the server 18 for generating digital signatures” (paragraph 0043, emphasis added). A “consumer application allows the client 16 to communicate with the server 18 and can be a plug-in program for a web browser” (Cocotis, paragraph 0043). Cocotis may arguably describe embedding a public key in a plug-in program used by a web browser, but Cocotis does not teach or suggest “*developing a link to the signature and storing the link in the web page,*” as amended in Applicant’s claim 1.

The Office states that “*storing the signature in the web page*,” from Applicant’s claim 1 is taught or suggested by Cocotis paragraphs 0060 and 0061. Cocotis describes a system in which “[f]or each individual content file that already resides locally, the client 16 uses the *public key embedded in the consumer application* to validate each individual server digital signature received from the server 18” (paragraph 0061, emphasis added). Cocotis may arguably describe storing a public key in a consumer application. However, the Office has failed to provide any evidence that teaches or suggests “*storing the signature in the web page*,” as presently recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

Thus, Marconcini and Cocotis, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

The amendments to claim 1 are limited to presenting dependent claim 11 in independent form. Consequently, one or more claims presented herein have already been examined in the Office Action. Furthermore, Applicant explains herein why this already-examined claim is patentably distinguished from the references of record. Therefore, in accordance with 37 CFR §1.113 and MPEP 706.07(a), finality for the next Action would be premature.

Dependent claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-8.

Independent Claim 16

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 16**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 5, line 6; page 8, lines 2-5; page 13, line 4; page 15, line 8-page 16, line 7; page 16-lines 9-10; page 19, lines 3-5; original claims 17 and 20. Amended Claim 16 now recites a method of executing a supplemental television content application that comprises files, the method comprising:

determining if the files are arranged in a cluster, *wherein a cluster is a subset of the files grouped through logical organization*, and determining if any of the files are arranged in clusters comprises:

determining if an application start file has a record that includes one of a reference to an expression having a location of the signature, or the expression, *wherein the start file is a file that describes parameters to execute an associated application*;

reading from the expression the location of a file having a signature of a cluster for each cluster, wherein the reading operation further comprises reading whether there are delegates for the clusters, and determining if a signature is valid based on a delegate *wherein the delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer* and

determining if the signatures can be verified;

determining the identify of all clusters that comprise the application;

for each cluster,

determining the location of the signature of the cluster by a signature location metadata expression;

determining the files that compose the cluster by a cluster information metadata expression;

determining a delegate name and constraints imposed on the authority of the delegate, wherein the constraints comprise time boundaries; and

verifying the integrity of the files in the cluster by operations including verifying the signature.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is anticipated by Marconcini.

Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “wherein a cluster is a subset of the files grouped through logical organization,” “wherein the start file is a file that describes parameters to execute an associated application,” “wherein the delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer,” or “determining a delegate name and constraints imposed on the authority of the delegate, wherein the constraints comprise time boundaries,” as presently recited in Applicant’s amended claim 16.

As discussed during the interview, claim 16 as amended patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 16.

Dependent claims 18-19 and 21-22 depend from independent claim 16 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 18-19 and 21-22.

Independent Claim 25

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 25**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 8, lines 1-5; page 13, lines 7-14; page 17, line 20; and FIG. 1. Amended claim 25 now recites a supplemental television content architecture comprising:

an application comprising a collection of files;
a cluster of the files, wherein the cluster is a subset of the files grouped through a logical organization,
the files comprising:
a signature file comprising a cluster signature, a reference to the cluster, and a time version information;
a security information resource file comprising a cluster information metadata, a signature location metadata, and a delegate metadata; and
a start file including a link to the security information resource file or the security information file,
wherein the signature location metadata describes a location of the signature file by a link,
wherein the cluster signature includes a hash code of each of the files comprising the cluster and a digital signature for signing the hash code of each of the files,
wherein the time version information describes the version of the signature file as a function of the files in the cluster, and
wherein the delegate metadata comprises identity and constraints of a delegate.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is anticipated by Marconcini.

Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “a cluster of the files, wherein the cluster is a subset of the files grouped through a logical organization,” “a security information resource file comprising a cluster information metadata, a signature location metadata, and a delegate metadata,” “wherein the signature location metadata describes a location of the signature file by a link,” “wherein the cluster signature includes a hash code of each of the files comprising the cluster,” “wherein the time version information describes the version of the signature file as a function of the files in the cluster,” or “wherein the delegate metadata comprises identity and constraints of a delegate,” as presently recited in Applicant’s amended claim 25.

As discussed during the interview, claim 25 as presently presented patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 25.

Dependent claims 26, 27 and 30 depend from independent claim 25 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Regarding amended claim 26, Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “security information resource file further comprises a policy declaration that specifies the location of a permission request file which indicates allowed and disallowed operations for the application and a policy declaration that defines the location of a privacy statement,” as presently recited in the amended claim. Support for this amendment is found at least in the specification as originally filed on page 18 lines 20-21 and page 19, line 1. Thus, there is no new matter, and this claim is allowable over the cited references.

Regarding amended claim 27, Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “wherein the signature is composed of a Reference element, a KeyInfo element, a DigestValue element, a SignatureValue element, and a VersionNumber element, wherein the VersionNumber element provides versions for signature files under a separate namespace, using a SignatureProperties element,” as presently recited in the amended claim. Support for this amendment is found at least in the specification as originally filed on page 21, lines 1-15 and page 21, line 22-page 22, line 2. Thus, there is no new matter, and this claim is allowable over the cited references.

For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 26, 27, and 30.

Independent Claim 31

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 31**. Amended Claim 31 now recites one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising:

identifying at least a first portion of supplemental television content application files in at least one cluster;
determining a cluster signature for each cluster; and
developing an expression that includes the location of the signature, wherein a second portion of the files comprises a web page and further comprising determining a signature for each web page by determining at least one of:
developing a link to the signature and storing the link in the web page; or
storing the signature in the web page.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed by Marconcini.

The amendments to claim 31 incorporate the recitation of claim 39 which depended on claim 31 and claim 41 which depended on claim 39. Thus, amended claim 31 now presents original dependent claim 41 in independent form. The Office rejected dependent claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marconcini in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0112162 (Cocotis). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

For at least reason similar to those asserted with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant asserts that claim 31 is patentable over at least the references of record and that finality of the next Action would be premature. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 31.

Dependent claims 32-38 and 40 depend from independent claim 31 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 32-38 and 40.

Independent Claim 46

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 46**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 5, line 6; page 8, lines 2-5; page 13, line 4; page 15, line 8-page 16, line 7; page 16, lines 9-10; page 19, lines 3-5; original claims 47 and 50. Amended Claim 46 now recites one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising:

determining if supplemental television content application files are arranged in a cluster, *wherein a cluster is a subset of the files grouped through logical organization*, and determining if the files are arranged in clusters comprises:

determining if an application start file has a record that includes one of a reference to an expression having a location of the signature, and the expression, *wherein the start file is a file that describes parameters to execute an associated application*;

reading from the expression the location of a file having a signature of a cluster for each cluster, wherein the reading operation further comprises reading whether there are delegates for the clusters, and determining if a signature is valid based on the delegates *wherein a delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer*; and

determining if the signatures can be verified;

determining the identify of the clusters that comprise the application;

for each cluster,
determining the location of the signature of the cluster files
that compose the cluster by a signature location metadata
expression;
determining the files that compose the cluster by a cluster
information metadata expression;
*determining a delegate name and constraints imposed on
the authority of the delegate, wherein the constraints comprise
time boundaries;* and
verifying the integrity of the files in the cluster by
operations including verifying the signature.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is anticipated by Marconcini.

For at least reasons similar to those asserted with respect to claim 16, amended claim 46 patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 46.

Dependent claims 48-49 and 51-52 depend from independent claim 46 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 48-49 and 51-52.

§ 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 9-15, 17, 22-24, 29-30, 39-45, 47, and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,834,110 (Marconcini) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 202/0112162 (Cocotis). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 12

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 12**. Support for this

amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 17, line 20; page 18, line 10; page 19, lines 3-5; original claims 13 and 14. Amended Claim 12 now recites a method of signing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising:

identifying a first portion of the files that together compose a web page;
determining a signature for the web page;
storing one of a link to the signature in the web page, or the signature in the web page; and
developing an expression that includes signature information, and storing the expression in the web page as metadata;
wherein the expression comprises at least one of security policy information data or delegate data;
wherein the delegate data includes identities and constraints of a delegate; and
wherein a delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is obvious from the combination of Marconcini and Cocotis.

Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “wherein the delegate data includes identities and constraints of a delegate, and wherein a delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer,” as presently recited in Applicant’s amended claim 12. As discussed during the interview, claim 12 as presently presented patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 12.

Dependent claims 13-15 depend from independent claim 12 and are allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that they recite. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

Regarding amended claim 13, Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “a syntactical extension of an XML link element provides reverse linkage between an XML document and the signature, and the signature is composed of a Reference element, a KeyInfo element, a DigestValue element, a SignatureValue element, and a VersionNumber element, wherein the VersionNumber element provides versions for signature files under a separate namespace, using a SignatureProperties element,” as presently recited in the amended claim. Support for this amendment is found at least in the specification as originally filed on page 19 lines 11-13; page 21, lines 1-15; and page 21, line 22-page 22, line 2. Thus, there is no new matter, and the claim is allowable over the cited references.

Regarding amended claim 14, Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “wherein the security policy information data comprises at least one of specifying a location of a permission request file that indicates allowed and disallowed operations for the application and defining a location of a privacy statement,” as presently recited in the amended claim. Support for this amendment is found at least in the specification as originally filed on page 18, line 19-page 19, line 2. Thus, there is no new matter, and the claim is allowable over the cited references.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 13-15.

Independent Claim 23

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 23**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 27, lines 4-9. Amended Claim 23 now recites a method of executing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising:

determining if files compose web pages; and
if the files compose web pages, then
 for each of the web pages,
 decoding the web page to determine if the web page has
one of a link to a digital signature and a digital signature,
 reading the signature, and
 verifying the signature,
 *if at least one of the web pages lack the link to a digital
signature, lack the digital signature, or the signature is not
verified then performing at least one of warning a user that a file
has not been signed, warning the user that the signature is not
valid, rejecting the file, or restricting access by the web page to
system resources.*

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is obvious from the combination of Marconcini and Cocotis.

Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the cited references of “if at least one of the web pages lack the link to a digital signature, lack the digital signature, or the signatures is not verified then performing at least one of warning a user that a file has not been signed, warning the user that the signature is not valid, rejecting the file, or restricting access by the web page to system resources,” as presently recited in Applicant’s amended claim 23. As discussed during the interview, claim 23 as amended patentably distinguishes over the cited

references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 23.

Dependent claim 24 depends from independent claim 23 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 24.

Independent Claim 42

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 42**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 17, line 20; page 18, line 10; page 19, lines 3-5; original claims 13 and 14. Amended Claim 42 now recites one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising:

- identifying a first portion of the files that together compose a web page;
- determining a signature for the web page;
- storing one of a link to the signature in the web page, or the signature in the web page; and
- developing an expression that includes signature information, and storing the expression in the web page as metadata,
- wherein the expression comprises at least one of security policy information data or delegate data,
- wherein the delegate data includes identities and constraints of a delegate, and*
- wherein the delegate is an entity that is authorized to sign portions of the application in addition to a main signer.*

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable media is obvious from the combination of Marconcini and Cocotis.

For at least reasons similar to those asserted with respect to claim 12, amended claim 42 patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 42.

Dependent claim 45 depends from independent claim 42 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 45.

Independent Claim 53

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 53**. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed at least on page 27, lines 4-9. Amended Claim 53 now recites one or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising:

determining if files compose web pages; and
if the files compose web pages, then
for each of the web pages, decoding the web page to
determine if the web page has one of a link to a digital
signature and a digital signature,
reading the signature, and
verifying the signature,
*if at least one of the web pages lack the link to a digital
signature, lack the digital signature, or the signature is not
verified then performing at least one of warning a user that a file
has not been signed, warning the user that the signature is not*

valid, rejecting the file, or restricting access by the web page to system resources.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable media is obvious from the combination of Marconcini and Cocotis.

For at least reasons similar to those asserted with respect to claim 23, amended claim 53 patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 53.

Dependent claim 54 depends from independent claim 53 and is allowable by virtue of this dependency, as well as for additional features that it recites. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 54.

NEW CLAIM 55

Applicant adds new independent claim 55. Support for this new claim is found at least on page 8, line 1, page 17, lines 3 and 20 and claim 25 of the specification as originally filed. Claim 55 is allowable for at least the reasons asserted with respect to claim 25. Additionally, Applicant has searched and failed to find any evidence in Sudia and Cocotis of “the signature changes as the web page changes,” as presently recited in Applicant’s claim 55. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Applicant respectfully requests examination and prompt allowance of claim 55.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-8, 10, 12-16, 18, 19, 21-27, 30-38, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48-49, and 51-55 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections and an early notice of allowance. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Date: April 14, 2008

By: /Benjamin Keim/
Benjamin A. Keim
Reg. No. 59,217
509.324.9256 ext. 248

Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
509.324.9256 ext. 258